

FORM
2A

Rev
08/13

State of Colorado
Oil and Gas Conservation Commission

1120 Lincoln Street, Suite 801, Denver, Colorado 80203
Phone: (303) 894-2100 Fax: (303) 894-2109



Document Number:

400662720

0

Date Received:

12/09/2014

Oil and Gas Location Assessment

☐ New Location ☐ Refile ☒ Amend Existing Location Location#: 322976

Submit signed original form. This Oil and Gas Location Assessment is to be submitted to the COGCC for approval prior to any ground disturbance activity associated with oil and gas operations. Approval of this Oil and Gas Location Assessment will allow for the construction of the below specified Location; however, it does not supersede any land use rules applied by the local land use authority. Please see the COGCC website at <http://cogcc.state.co.us/> for all accompanying information pertinent this Oil and Gas Location Assessment.

Location ID:

322976

Expiration Date:

05/30/2019

☐ This location assessment is included as part of a permit application.

CONSULTATION

- ☐ This location is included in a Comprehensive Drilling Plan. CDP # _____
- ☐ This location is in a sensitive wildlife habitat area.
- ☐ This location is in a wildlife restricted surface occupancy area.
- ☐ This location includes a Rule 306.d.(1)A.ii. variance request.

Operator

Operator Number: 100185
Name: ENCANA OIL & GAS (USA) INC
Address: 370 17TH ST STE 1700
City: DENVER State: CO Zip: 80202-5632

Contact Information

Name: Toby Sachen
Phone: (720) 876-5845
Fax: (720) 876-6584
email: toby.sachen@encana.com

RECLAMATION FINANCIAL ASSURANCE

☒ Plugging and Abandonment Bond Surety ID: 20100017 ☐ Gas Facility Surety ID: _____
☐ Waste Management Surety ID: _____

LOCATION IDENTIFICATION

Name: Rasmussen Facilities Pad Number: 19H-M268
County: WELD
QuarterQuarter: SWSW Section: 19 Township: 2N Range: 68W Meridian: 6 Ground Elevation: 4996
Define a single point as a location reference for the facility location. When the location is to be used as a well site then the point shall be a well location.
Footage at surface: 952 feet FSL from North or South section line
1309 feet FWL from East or West section line
Latitude: 40.119235 Longitude: -105.050730
PDOP Reading: 2.4 Date of Measurement: 07/16/2014
Instrument Operator's Name: Ryan Christi

RELATED REMOTE LOCATIONS

(Enter as many Related Locations as necessary. Enter the Form 2A document # only if there is no established COGCC Location ID#)

This proposed Oil and Gas Location is:

LOCATION ID #

FORM 2A DOC #

Production Facilities Location serves Well(s)

400750429

FACILITIES

Indicate the number of each type of oil and gas facility planned on location

Wells	5	Oil Tanks*	28	Condensate Tanks*		Water Tanks*	6	Buried Produced Water Vaults*	
Drilling Pits		Production Pits*		Special Purpose Pits		Multi-Well Pits*		Modular Large Volume Tanks	
Pump Jacks		Separators*	13	Injection Pumps*		Cavity Pumps*		Gas Compressors*	
Gas or Diesel Motors*		Electric Motors		Electric Generators*		Fuel Tanks*		LACT Unit*	
Dehydrator Units*		Vapor Recovery Unit*	8	VOC Combustor*	13	Flare*		Pigging Station*	1

OTHER FACILITIES*

Other Facility Type

Number

Buffer Vessel	1
Electrical/Automation skid	1
40 ft VRT	1
Drip pot blowcase	1

Those facilities indicated by an asterisk () shall be used to determine the distance from the Production Facility to the nearest cultural feature on the Cultural Setbacks Tab.

Per Rule 303.b.(3)C, description of all oil, gas, and/or water pipelines:

Oil, water and gas will flow combined to the facilities pad from the well pad to the south The flowline is 3" FCA3 steel, epoxy coated, welded and pressure tested. It will be buried 4' deep.
Gas pipeline will be determined by KMG at a later date.

If the oil and water are sent to the Hub, DOT 195 pipeline will be used. (Please see comments on Submit tab for explanation)

CONSTRUCTION

Date planned to commence construction: 12/01/2015 Size of disturbed area during construction in acres: 5.00

Estimated date that interim reclamation will begin: 02/01/2017 Size of location after interim reclamation in acres: 5.00

Estimated post-construction ground elevation: 4996

DRILLING PROGRAM

Will a closed loop system be used for drilling fluids: Yes

Is H₂S anticipated? No

Will salt sections be encountered during drilling: No

Will salt based mud (>15,000 ppm Cl) be used? No

Will oil based drilling fluids be used? No

DRILLING WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Drilling Fluids Disposal: _____ Drilling Fluids Disposal Method: _____

Cutting Disposal: _____ Cuttings Disposal Method: _____

Other Disposal Description:

Beneficial reuse or land application plan submitted? No

Reuse Facility ID: _____ or Document Number: _____

Centralized E&P Waste Management Facility ID, if applicable: _____

SURFACE & MINERALS & RIGHT TO CONSTRUCT

Name: Rasmussen Family Farms

Phone: _____

Address: 8120 County Road 1

Fax: _____

Address: _____

Email: _____

City: Longmont State: CO Zip: 80504

Surface Owner: ☒ Fee ☐ State ☐ Federal ☐ Indian

Check all that apply. The Surface Owner: ☒ is the mineral owner

☒ is committed to an oil and Gas Lease

☐ has signed the Oil and Gas Lease

☐ is the applicant

The Mineral Owner beneath this Oil and Gas Location is: ☒ Fee ☐ State ☐ Federal ☐ Indian

The Minerals beneath this Oil and Gas Location will be developed from or produced to this Oil and Gas Location: Yes

The right to construct this Oil and Gas Location is granted by: oil and gas lease

Surface damage assurance if no agreement is in place: _____ Surface Surety ID: _____

Date of Rule 306 surface owner consultation _____

CURRENT AND FUTURE LAND USE

Current Land Use (Check all that apply):

Crop Land: ☒ Irrigated ☐ Dry land ☐ Improved Pasture ☐ Hay Meadow ☐ CRP

Non-Crop Land: ☐ Rangeland ☐ Timber ☐ Recreational ☐ Other (describe): _____

Subdivided: ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☐ Residential

Future Land Use (Check all that apply):

Crop Land: ☒ Irrigated ☐ Dry land ☐ Improved Pasture ☐ Hay Meadow ☐ CRP

Non-Crop Land: ☐ Rangeland ☐ Timber ☐ Recreational ☐ Other (describe): _____

Subdivided: ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☐ Residential

CULTURAL DISTANCE INFORMATION

Provide the distance to the nearest cultural feature as measured from Wells or Production Facilities onsite.

	From WELL	From PRODUCTION FACILITY
Building:	595 Feet	433 Feet
Building Unit:	819 Feet	797 Feet
High Occupancy Building Unit:	5280 Feet	5280 Feet
Designated Outside Activity Area:	5280 Feet	5280 Feet
Public Road:	982 Feet	716 Feet
Above Ground Utility:	711 Feet	601 Feet
Railroad:	5280 Feet	5280 Feet
Property Line:	1004 Feet	736 Feet

INSTRUCTIONS:

- All measurements shall be provided from center of nearest Well or edge of nearest Production Facility to nearest of each cultural feature as described in Rule 303.b.(3)A.
- Enter 5280 for distance greater than 1 mile.
- Building - nearest building of any type. If nearest Building is a Building Unit, enter same distance for both.
- Building Unit, High Occupancy Building Unit, and Designated Outside Activity Area - as defined in 100-Series Rules.
- For measurement purposes only, Production Facilities should only include those items with an asterisk(*) on the Facilities Tab.

DESIGNATED SETBACK LOCATION INFORMATION

Check all that apply. This location is within a: ☒ Buffer Zone
☐ Exception Zone
☐ Urban Mitigation Area

- Buffer Zone - as described in Rule 604.a.(2), within 1,000' of a Building Unit.
- Exception Zone - as described in Rule 604.a.(1), within 500' of a Building Unit.
- Urban Mitigation Area - as defined in 100-Series Rules.

Pre-application Notifications (required if location is within 1,000 feet of a building unit):

Date of Rule 305.a.(1) Urban Mitigation Area Notification to Local Government: _____

Date of Rule 305.a.(2) Buffer Zone Notification to Building Unit Owners: 08/15/2014

FOR MULTI-WELL PADS AND PRODUCTION FACILITIES WITHIN DESIGNATED SETBACK LOCATIONS ONLY:

- ☒ Check this box if this Oil and Gas Location has or will have Production Facilities that serve multiple wells (on or offsite) and the Production Facilities are proposed to be located less than 1,000 feet from a Building Unit. *(Pursuant to Rule 604.c.(2)E.i., the operator must evaluate alternative locations for the Production Facilities that are farther from the Building Unit, and determine whether those alternative locations were technically feasible and economically practicable for the same proposed development.)*
- ☒ By checking this box, I certify that no alternative placements for the Production Facilities, farther from the nearest Building Unit, were available based on the analysis conducted pursuant to Rule 604.c.(2)E.i.

In the space below, explain rationale for siting the multi-well Production Facility(ies) that supports your Rule 604.c.(2)E.i determination. Attach documentation that supports your determination to this Form 2A.

The new planned production facilities are being incorporated into an existing facilities location that is already encumbering the irrigated farm land. The closest home (to the SW of the location) is the surface owners home and he would prefer to keep the facilities for all wells in one location to accommodate his farming operations. Additionally, the access for the facilities is already in place and allows for direct access off of County Line road (paved) versus the alternate of having our truck traffic on a residential dirt road which would affect the nearby neighbors.

SOIL

List all soil map units that occur within the proposed location. attach the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) report showing the "Map Unit Description" report listing the soil typical vertical profile. This data is to be used when segregating topsoil.

The required information can be obtained from the NRCS web site at <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.org/> or from the COGCC web site GIS Online map page found at <http://colorado.gov/cogcc>. Instructions are provided within the COGCC web site help section.

NRCS Map Unit Name: 15 - Colby_loam_1_to_3_percent_slopes

NRCS Map Unit Name: 64 - Thedalund_loam_1_to_3_percent_slopes

NRCS Map Unit Name: 79 - Weld_loam_1_to_3_percent_slopes

PLANT COMMUNITY:

Complete this section only if any portion of the disturbed area of the location's current land use is on non-crop land.

Are noxious weeds present: Yes ☒ No ☐

Plant species from: ☐ NRCS or, ☐ field observation Date of observation: _____

List individual species: _____

Check all plant communities that exist in the disturbed area.

- ☐ Disturbed Grassland (Cactus, Yucca, Cheatgrass, Rye)
☐ Native Grassland (Bluestem, Grama, Wheatgrass, Buffalograss, Fescue, Oatgrass, Brome)
☐ Shrub Land (Mahogany, Oak, Sage, Serviceberry, Chokecherry)
☐ Plains Riparian (Cottonwood, Willow, Aspen, Maple, Poplar, Russian Olive, Tamarisk)
☐ Mountain Riparian (Cottonwood, Willow, Blue Spruce)
☐ Forest Land (Spruce, Fir, Ponderosa Pine, Lodgepole Pine, Juniper, Pinyon, Aspen)
☐ Wetlands Aquatic (Bullrush, Sedge, Cattail, Arrowhead)
☐ Alpine (above timberline)
☐ Other (describe): _____

WATER RESOURCES

Is this a sensitive area: ☐ No ☒ Yes

Distance to nearest

downgradient surface water feature: _____ 50 Feet

water well: _____ 2095 Feet

Estimated depth to ground water at Oil and Gas Location _____ 4 Feet

Basis for depth to groundwater and sensitive area determination:

Sensitive area based on depth to groundwater.
Water well permit # 146570 with a static water level of 4'.
Surface water is an irrigation ditch 50 feet to the south and creek 1,935 feet south.

Is the location in a riparian area: ☒ No ☐ Yes

Was an Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit filed ☒ No ☐ Yes If yes attach permit.

Is the location within a Rule 317B Surface Water Supply Area buffer _____ No
zone:

If the location is within a Rule 317B Surface Water Supply Area buffer have all public water supply systems within 15 miles been notified: _____

Is the Location within a Floodplain? ☐ No ☐ Yes Floodplain Data Sources Reviewed (check all that apply)

☐ Federal (FEMA)

☐ State

☐ County

☐ Local

☐ Other _____

GROUNDWATER BASELINE SAMPLING AND MONITORING AND WATER WELL SAMPLING

Water well sampling required per Rule _____ 318A

DESIGNATED SETBACK LOCATION EXCEPTIONS

Check all that apply:

- ☐ Rule 604.a.(1)A. Exception Zone (within 500' of Building Unit)
- ☐ Rule 604.b.(1)A. Exception Location (existing or approved Oil & Gas Location now within a Designated Setback as a result of Rule 604.a.)
- ☐ Rule 604.b.(1)B. Exception Location (existing or approved Oil & Gas Location is within a Designated Setback due to Building Unit construction after Location approval)
- ☐ Rule 604.b.(2) Exception Location (SUA or site-specific development plan executed on or before August 1, 2013)
- ☐ Rule 604.b.(3) Exception Location (Building Units constructed after August 1, 2013 within setback per an SUA or site-specific development plan)

RULE 502.b VARIANCE REQUEST

- ☐ Rule 502.b. Variance Request from COGCC Rule or Spacing Order Number _____

ALL exceptions and variances require attached Request Letter(s). Refer to applicable rule for additional required attachments (e.g. waivers, certifications, SUAs).

OPERATOR COMMENTS AND SUBMITTAL

Comments Encana is planning this location with two gathering options: Option 1. All the equipment listed on the Facilities tab will be on this location and there will be no centralized gathering; Option 2. Centralized gathering. If Option 2 is employed, the following equipment will be needed on the location: 12 separators, 2 oil surge drums, 2 oil pump skids, 1 water surge drum, 1 water pump skid, 1 instrument air skid, 1 electrical rack/electrical equipment. Location 435499, the Liquids Handling Hub in Erie would be receiving the product in this second option.

I hereby certify that the statements made in this form are, to the best of my knowledge, true, correct and complete.

Signed: _____ Date: 12/09/2014 Email: toby.sachen@encana.com

Print Name: Toby Sachen Title: Regulatory Analyst

Based on the information provided herein, this Application for Permit-to-Drill complies with COGCC Rules and applicable orders and is hereby approved.

COGCC Approved:  Director of COGCC Date: 5/31/2016

Conditions Of Approval

All representations, stipulations and conditions of approval stated in this Form 2A for this location shall constitute representations, stipulations and conditions of approval for any and all subsequent operations on the location unless this Form 2A is modified by Sundry Notice, Form 4 or an Amended Form 2A.

COA Type

Description

	The approved Form 2A for this location will be posted onsite during construction, drilling, and completions operations.
--	---

Best Management Practices

No BMP/COA Type

Description

1	Planning	Wildlife: Encana will comply with all state and federal wildlife laws including, but not limited to, the Migratory Bird Act. Encana may hire ecological consultants to survey the planned location for wildlife habitat. The consultants provide a report that outlines the requirements and recommendations to Encana to reduce the risk of impacting wildlife at the site
2	Traffic control	Under Rule 604.c.(2).D, if required by the local government, a traffic plan shall be coordinated with the local jurisdiction prior to commencement of move in and rig up. Any subsequent modification to the traffic plan must be coordinated with the local jurisdiction.

3	Traffic control	Encana will commission a Traffic Control Plan from Northern Colorado Traffic Control, Inc. that will show the locations of "Utility Work Ahead" and "Trucks Turning" signs during the Construction, Drilling and Completion phases, approximately 11 months. Work hours and delivery times will be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. There may be flaggers during the heavy traffic days.
4	General Housekeeping	Per Rule 604.c.(2)P. All surface trash, debris, scrap or discarded material connected with the operations of the property shall be removed from the premises or disposed of in a legal manner.
5	General Housekeeping	Per Rule Rule 604.c(2)T. The well site will be cleared of all non-essential equipment, trash and debris after ninety days of a well P&A.
6	General Housekeeping	Per Rule 604.c(2)U. and Rule 319.a(5), Encana will identify plugged and abandoned wellbores according to Rule 319.a.(5). including the location of the wellbore with a permanent monument as specified in Rule 319.a.(5). Encana will also inscribe or imbed the well number and date of plugging upon the permanent monument.
7	General Housekeeping	Per Rule 604.C(2)N. Any material not in use that might constitute a fire hazard will be removed a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet from the wellhead, tanks and separator. Any electrical equipment installations inside the bermed area will comply with API RP 500 classifications and comply with the current national electrical code as adopted by the State of Colorado.
8	General Housekeeping	For a traditional facility built on the location, Encana will remove unused equipment as production declines. This serves to reduce the size of the pad over time as well as reduce the visual impact.
9	Material Handling and Spill Prevention	"• Annual hydrostatic test on the oil dump line from the separator to the tank battery. • Annual hydrostatic "static" tests on our oil tanks. • Annual hydrostatic "static" tests on our produced water tank and water dump line from the separator to the produced water tank. • Lease Operator inspections of all equipment not to exceed 48 hours. • Monthly documented inspections (EU). • Annual environmental inspections of all battery and well equipment and pads. • Annual UT inspections of the pressure vessels and input into Encana's RIPL Predictive Integrity Maintenance Program. (HLP separators and fuel gas separators)"
10	Material Handling and Spill Prevention	Per Rule 805.b.(3)B.iii. Well effluent containing more than ten (10) barrels per day of condensate or within two (2) hours after first encountering hydrocarbon gas of salable quality will be directed to a combination of sand traps, separators, surge vessels, and tanks as needed to ensure safe separation of sand, hydrocarbon liquids, water, and gas and to ensure salable products are efficiently recovered for sale or conserved and that non-salable products are disposed of in a safe and environmentally responsible manner. All salable quality gas shall be directed to the sales line as soon as practicable or shut-in and conserved. Wells will be hooked up to the gas line at flowback.
11	Construction	Per Rule 604.c.(2)A. The pad will be constructed in such a manner that noise mitigation may be installed and removed without disturbing the site or landscaping.
12	Construction	Per Rule 604.c.(2)S. Subject pad will have all weather access roads to allow for operator and emergency response.
13	Construction	Encana utilizes 24" tall corrugated galvanized metal berm walls with a capacity in excess of 150% of the largest tank contained within the wall. In addition, Encana best practices mandates the use of impervious liners that extends under each storage tank and up the walls, permanently affixed to the top of the metal berm wall. Protrusions of piping that come through the liner include a fully sealed "boot" to prevent leakage.

14	Construction	Per Rule 604.c(2)M. Encana will install fencing to restrict access to wellheads and equipment. (If in a town, "Fencing style will be installed as required by the town".)
15	Construction	Per Rule 604.c(2)S. At the time of construction, all leasehold roads will be constructed to accommodate local emergency vehicle access requirements, and will be maintained in a reasonable condition.
16	Noise mitigation	Encana will perform a baseline noise survey prior to any operational activity measuring dBA at a distance 350 feet from the noise source or sound levels will be measured at a point twenty-five (25) feet from the structure towards the noise source. In situations where measurement of noise levels at three hundred and fifty (350) feet is impractical or unrepresentative due to topography, the measurement may be taken at a lesser distance and extrapolated to a 350-foot equivalent using the formula stated in Rule 802 of the State of Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission. Encana's current plan is to install temporary sound walls to surround this location to minimize noise and light impacts during drilling and completions and to install permanent noise mitigation at the facility location to meet all COGCC regulations. Should technological advancements allow for quieter equipment or better noise mitigation at the time of drilling and completion operations on this location, Encana will re-evaluate the most effective method at that time.
17	Noise mitigation	The subject location will be constructed to allow potential future noise mitigation installation without disturbance.
18	Emissions mitigation	Per Rule 604.c(2)C.i. Flow lines, separators, and sand traps capable of supporting green completions as described in Rule 805 will be installed on subject location at which commercial quantities of gas are reasonably expected to be produced based on existing adjacent wells within 1 mile.
19	Emissions mitigation	Per Rule 604.c(2)C.iii. Temporary flowback flaring and oxidizing equipment will include: adequately sized equipment to handle 1.5 times the largest flowback volume of gas experienced in a ten mile radius. If there is overrun, Encana will shut in the well versus freely venting. Wells will be hooked up to the gas line at flowback.
20	Emissions mitigation	Per Rule 604.c(2)F Encana will follow and comply with all leak detection and repair and storage tank emission management plan conditions as required by Colorado Air Quality Control Commission Regulation Number 7. This will include at least monthly Audible, Visual and Olfactory (AVO) inspections of the components and tanks at our Production Facilities at most weekly or at least monthly starting on January 1, 2015. In addition, Encana will perform infra-red camera inspections of these components and the storage tanks at most monthly or at least annually.
21	Emissions mitigation	Encana will employ an automated system to notify company personnel of any issues on location, such as equipment failure, so Encana can promptly address the issue.
22	Emissions mitigation	For at least the first year, the site will be visited daily by lease operators who will ensure proper functioning of all equipment, including emission control equipment. In the case where production is sent to a centralized facility, the site will be visited daily for six months to one year.
23	Interim Reclamation	Encana follows all regulations created by the State of Colorado and COGCC associated with noxious weeds. Encana hires contractors to control weeds and conduct reclamation at all sites. The COGCC inspects and approves all reclamation of Encana sites.

Total: 23 comment(s)

Attachment Check List

<u>Att Doc Num</u>	<u>Name</u>
166857	RULE 306.E. CERTIFICATION
1668742	CORRESPONDENCE
1668851	CORRESPONDENCE
1668855	FACILITY DRAWING
1668872	ACCESS ROAD MAP
1668909	HYDROLOGY MAP
400662720	FORM 2A SUBMITTED
400686769	NRCS MAP UNIT DESC
400686773	NRCS MAP UNIT DESC
400686775	NRCS MAP UNIT DESC
400700001	WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
400734809	LOCATION PICTURES
400737057	OTHER
400745114	LOCATION DRAWING

Total Attach: 14 Files

General Comments

<u>User Group</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Comment Date</u>
Permit	Unchecked "This location assessment is included as part of a permit application". Wells already drilled. Final Review Completed.	5/27/2016 11:11:22 AM
OGLA	Based on the information provided by the Operator, COGCC has determined that this proposed Oil and Gas Location meets the requirements for conditional approval based on compliance with COGCC Rules, including, but not limited to; Rule 604 Series Setback and Mitigation Measures. The Operator has presented a siting rationale for the Production Facilities in the Buffer Zone and Best Management Practices that adequately address site specific environmental, health, safety and welfare concerns. OGLA task passed.	5/25/2016 11:29:48 AM
OGLA	Operator sent, via email, a revised noise mitigation BMP (#16) detailing more specifics on how, where, and what noise mitigation will be used at the location. Operator concurred with COA for posting 2A onsite	5/17/2016 10:04:36 AM
OGLA	Operator sent email 3/7/16 with traffic BMP for flaggers - added to BMP section	3/17/2016 1:48:03 PM
OGLA	Operator reviewed COAs and responded via email, COGCC sent an email for clarification on the widening of the road for well pad and the flaring concerns.	2/29/2016 3:41:55 PM
OGLA	Operator sent updated hydrology map - replaced. Updated nearest downgradient surface water body is irrigation ditch 50 feet south, stream is 1,935 feet. Two water wells both 2,095 feet from the locaiton. Waiting on road expansion information.	1/30/2016 12:39:09 PM
Permit	Added Cultural setbacks for wells per operator's email. building 595', building unit 819', above ground utility 711', railroad 5280', public road 982', property line 1004, high occupancy building 5280. Permitting Review Complete.	1/12/2016 10:42:14 AM
Permit	ON HOLD: Changed from Facility only to 5 well location. Requesting Cultural setbacks for wells.	12/23/2015 11:27:47 AM
OGLA	Updated Access road map provided by the Operator. Emailed the Operator to update the hydrology map with the 1,000 foot radius and distances from the edge of disturbance.	12/17/2015 1:28:10 PM

OGLA	Based on the information provided by the Operator, COGCC has determined that this proposed Oil and Gas Location meets the requirements for conditional approval based on compliance with COGCC Rules, including, but not limited to; Rule 604 Series Setback and Mitigation Measures. The Operator has presented a siting rationale for the Production Facilities in the Buffer Zone and Best Management Practices that adequately address site specific environmental, health, safety and welfare concerns.	12/14/2015 3:02:58 PM
OGLA	Operator sent additional information regarding gas sales lines and timing for flowback to sales lines. COGCC added to BMPs and with Operator concurrence removed references to the cemetery and Road 18 as the production facility is accessed from the north.	12/14/2015 3:01:19 PM
Permit	Permitting Review Complete.	12/9/2015 10:58:48 AM
OGLA	Operator sent over letter and attachment for 306e waiver. labeled as 306e certification in file.	11/24/2015 5:00:42 PM
OGLA	Operator provided new Facility layout drawing that matches facility count on 2A. New production will replace the existing and existing will be removed. Request 306e certification.	11/21/2015 10:28:20 AM
OGLA	Correspondence with operator regarding site specific BMPs attached as doc no 1668851 for adding to production 2A (this one) vs. the well only location (doc no 400750429) and what goes on both. Operator concured with COGCC to add BMP, 1,2,3,4,5,6,and 9 to this speicific Form 2A. Still working with Operator for exact facility count on the 2A to match the Facility Layout drawing.	11/2/2015 11:37:13 AM
OGLA	Meeting between COGCC and the Operator on 6/10/2015. Discussed citizen concerns regarding access, truck traffic, location, and plans for hub. COGCC is waiting for BMPs from the operator to address the citizen concerns.	6/12/2015 12:26:41 PM
OGLA	The Operator held a neighborhood meeting on 5/28/2015 to address access road and other concerns.	6/12/2015 11:58:33 AM
OGLA	Received email from operator with final equipment count. Updated underfacilities accordingly. No information on the road and still waiting on response from the operator regarding public comments.	2/27/2015 10:53:52 AM
OGLA	Had meeting with operator on 1/13/2015 regarding road access and sound mitigation. Emailed operator regarding status of previous equipent for amended location. Also waiting for operator to respond to comments.	2/26/2015 2:19:31 PM
OGLA	sent operator email regarding facilities list not including pig launcher and pervious facilities and BMP for 604.c.(2)N. Operator sent email adding BMP, adding pig launcher and getting more information on previous facilities.	1/15/2015 5:15:53 PM
Public	<p>According to the Colorado oil and gas conservation commissions online data; Encana Oil and Gasappears to have an approximate ground water contaminationrate of44% in Weld County. Such alleged COGCC facility iground water contamination rates warrant further investigation into whether this operator can operate in a manner consistent with the protection of public health safety and welfare are in accordance with the COGCCs mission.</p> <p>Also, there is a compendium of health studies that show mining using hydraulic fracturing is not safe and cannot be conducted in a manner consistent with public health, safety and welfare.</p> <p>http://concernedhealthny.org/compendium/</p> <p>Colorado citizens need to be able to protect themselves, their families, their environment, the values of their homes and exercise their civil rights to safety, but they cannot, and are in fact prohibited by the state and fracking industry to do so</p> <p>The associated risks of the fracking industry are too great, and a precautionary principle must be addressed before any operations take place. I recommend that the Rasmussen Well Pad 19H-M268 Form 2A #400750429 and 12 associated Form 2s located in Section 19 T2N R68W permit(s) be denied immediately.</p>	1/14/2015 11:33:25 PM

Public	<p>I am not opposed to drilling, and I believe we need energy independence.</p> <p>I am totally against the high density, high volume fracking that oil and gas companies are doing now. They have no regard for the health, air, water and contamination of land. I know from personal experience that land and aquifers have been polluted, 53 acres of our land was contaminated and one of my siblings aquifer was contaminated in the Fort Lupton area. These companies won't let people talk about it and it is not recorded! Please slow this mass fracking down and focus on the lives and well being of the people who live by these proposed high volume sites. I know our property values will drop drastically. Would you want this in YOUR FRONT YARD??????</p>	1/14/2015 3:24:06 PM	
Public	<p>Dear COGCC members,</p> <p>Please advise Encana to remove all 12 Form 2's for the 12 well-bores and the associated 2 Form 2 A's for the Rasmussen Section 19, 2N 68W SWSW and SWSE from the COGCC Website. They are incomplete and negligent applications. Approving these 14 applications is akin to putting the cart before the horse. All the pieces needed to make these proposals safe complete and accurate are not present, so if they are approved as is, there will be a constant bandaging process, mistakes made and a continual effort on the part of Encana to force the plans to work in our rural neighborhood.</p> <p>We have asked Mr. Parko to disapprove the wells and location assessment on January 14, 2015 when the Public Comment period ends for these wells on the COGCC website. It is the community's best determination that further study, evaluations, modifications and reconsiderations be included in a preapproval process for the applications, in order for the final proposal to be established as 100% safe for residents and the environment. And though we appreciate that there has been some effort on the part of Mr. Parko and Mr. Lepore to do some negotiation with Encana and that 2 mitigation measures have been newly offered, a VRU unit and lined wells, we feel that the 100% safety mark is nowhere near being met.</p> <p>The Location Assessment Form 2A's do not contain a CDPHE Assessment which have been requested numerous times by our community to the Weld county LGD, Mr. Parko. If Larimer County** can have a CDPHE assessment for health and safety of fracking sites, so can Weld County, and likely the results would be the same because there are inherent dangers and nuisances in Oil and Gas extraction and the same danger and nuisances exist in Weld County as in Larimer County. This is true especially in cases where there are residents who are at risk of living 1200-2000 feet away from High Volume</p> <p>Hydrofracturing (HVHF) Industrial Wells and Facility Sites, and many of our residents do live within this distance. Our established, historical, High Density neighborhood requests, again, that Mr. Parko give us the same respect and consideration the LGD in Larimer County gave his county residents and require a CDPHE Assessment for this site.</p> <p>As a neighborhood we have asked Mr. Parko to request a Traffic Study to be initiated and completed before the applications can be considered complete. This would need to be done in coordination with Boulder County for traffic on CR1 and our little Rd. 1, because Boulder County owns the west half of CR1 and maintains this 2 lane, in only fair condition, county road. No matter if or where any new wells may end up on the Rasmussen property, currently there are 3 access points from East County Line Road 1 onto the Rasmussen property and no access permits. This is potentially a violation of Weld county Code, please investigate this and inform me of the outcome. Encana has not done their due diligence around the legal nor the practical accessibility of Rd 18 for drilling 12 wells.</p>	1/14/2015 1:50:32 AM	

I believe that the above referenced site is a scale of operation that has not been seen before in this area and represents a severe threat to public health safety and welfare and environment. What is being proposed by Encana in this neighborhood, is not the same Oil and Gas extraction that has been happening in Weld County for 60 years, usually consisting of 1 ,2 or 3 wells often not fracked.The current Weld County and State rules regulating the application of any number of wells does not include a public process unless it is residential or will cause a visual change. These rules do not differentiate between small scale fracking sites and Industrial scale sites.This distinction needs to be proposed, and immediately acted upon, as it is significant. Two 12 well bore sites, a dramatic increase in the size of one facility site and another massive facility site are all being proposed in Section 19 by Encana, in addition to the 13 wells and 3 facility sites that are already on Section 19. The increased number of wells being proposed is a massive change in scale and is a violation of our rights to health safety welfare and to a clean, poison free environment. The High Volume Hydrofracturing site being proposed for our neighborhood is a different game, while the rules for fracking in this state were made for smaller operations.This is an emergency situation for Section 19.

Our area is along East County Road 1, and is an historical, rural neighborhood that sits on the border of Boulder and Weld Counties. We are a densely populated thriving agricultural use community with numerous historical markers. We likely have the same population as a Low Density Residential, and could be considered a High Density Agricultural zone if the distinction existed.Low Density Residential permitting process is 'Use by Special Review', and all agricultural land in Weld County is 'Use by Right'.There appears to be a zoning issue, we are stuck in the middle of two kinds of zones.This issue would need to be addressed at the local government level.However, for our circumstances, it puts us in a bad position for zoning because of timing.We need time to rezone our area if that is the only way we can get 'Use by Special Review' hearings in the Planning department of Weld County.

The current zoning rules do not account in any way for HVHF site distinctions: the excessive emissions, excessive nuisances which include light and noise trespassing, the visual blight of both the operations and the infrastructure of the facility site.Since there is not a distinction being made between all previous fracking and the current massive HVHF fracking, the COGCC rules for Oil and Gas Extraction are negligent and do not protect citizens or the environment from the egregious and dangerous violations inherent in HVHF.Permitting High Volume Hydrofracturing Industrial Facilities in Section 19 or Section 30 is a poorly considered change from Agricultural Zoning to Industrial Zoning.Building an Industrial site without Industrial zoning is a very disrespectful and dangerous thing to do, and should be illegal.Within current Weld County Code, if we were zoned Low Density Residential, we would have the benefit of 'Use by Special Permit'.Unfortunately, agricultural zoning doesn't contain the distinction between high and low density populations.However, our Agricultural zoning has served and protected the land and citizens in this historically significant community from development of all kinds for over 100 years.How could this zoning not be protecting us now from massive Industrial level operations?'Use by Right' for Oil and Gas extraction needs to be eliminated from all zoning, there needs to be a process for evaluating any location of 4 or more wells being proposed anywhere.

There is growing body of evidence that any oil and gas extraction and production facilities accommodating 4 or more wells represents a significant land use change. Accordingly these large sites of 4 or more wells are industrial scale and thus inappropriate within 2 miles of the intersection of East County Line Road 1 and Rd. 18.It is evident to all of the neighbors that would be severely affected by these 12 wells and the Facility site, that the scale of these proposals go outside of 'Use by Right' and should be considered for 'Use by Special Review'.There needs to be a public process, a Planning Assessment Hearing included in the pre-application part of the process. Weld Public Works and the Planning Department would then evaluate our concerns and then they could be clearly articulated and addressed in the proposal by Encana before formal applications for the 12 wells, 36, 25 foot high Tanks, 12 separators, 12+ burn-off towers, 1 VRU unit 40 feet high and other parts to the facility site (a total of 5 acres) would be submitted.

Let it be known and on record that I, Amanda Harper am asking for the rules in this situation to be adapted to the uniqueness of our neighborhood density and be considered as 'Use by Special Review'. I am asking you to remove the current applications and then, in a different pre-application process, incorporate new and vital views, concerns and recommendations and mitigations into any proposal that Encana brings to Weld County for review.

Additionally, the Encana site assessment has failed to take into account the viability of Encana using the ½ mile long one lane dirt road as the proposed access to the well sites ((both Rasmussen and Regnier another 12 well site and facility being proposed in February 2015)). This lane, maintained by residents is on private property and has been used with either necessary and/or prescriptive easements since the 1800's. This lane is the only access and egress for 7 families who are landlocked to the east. The road which now services about 20 vehicles a day and about 8-10 tanker trucks a week cannot support the anticipated exponential increase in use for both the drilling of the 12 wells, and then the other facility site for 12 more wells on the Regnier property. This Encana proposal would send 10's of thousands of tractor trailer and other truck traffic a day for 9 months to 1 year down this private road which would continue for at least another 18 months to the Regnier facility site during the high volume part of the production phase. This excessive use, for about 3 years, aside from destroying our way of life, would block the access and egress and present pronounced safety hazards for all the landlocked residents. The 10's of thousands of truck trips needed to construct, drill and access the production facilities, are inappropriate and excessive and absolutely do not belong on this lane. Again, this situation would cause extreme burden to the residents who live landlocked.

Therefore, we had asked that Mr. Parko request an assessment of Rd. 18 and a Traffic Study conducted with Boulder County to be completed with results available to our community. Mr. Parko has decided this is not a necessary assessment. We disagree wholeheartedly. We think the information that would be gained from investigation into this road, including the fact likely fact that a cemetery is partially on Rd. 18. Knowing what is going on with Rd. 18 is part of a necessary body of information to make an informed, intelligent and prudent decision for our landscape and our community's safety. The community needs to be a part of the road process to get the full picture.

Currently all HVHF sites I know of in this area are located where there are still sweeping open agricultural landscapes, our area is a rural neighborhood, enclosed and surrounding the ¼ mile X ¼ mile field where all of these operations are being proposed. We live in a unique setting that was until 1955 Pleasant View Ridge with a Post Office, cemetery, a school house, a connection to the railroad and thus numerous houses grew around Pleasant View Ridge and District 45, a Township that preceded Longmont. This site is completely inappropriate for the massive Industrial scale proposals Encana has applied for. Most residents live within 1200-2000 feet of the proposed wells and/or facility site.

We have also asked Mr. Parko to request a CDPHE Assessment of this site location. Many of the Property Owners who live in this agricultural neighborhood are longtime residents, over 18 years, and have been living with Oil and Gas operations for most of their lives here and yet, all but the mineral owner himself, are extremely concerned about the 2 proposed large scale high volume hydro-fracturing operations for Section 19. We are concerned about the emissions, the infrastructure and the truck traffic, noise violations and light violations. The increased nuisances that will occur are varied: huge numbers of large trucks turning corners and blocking our lane and causing dust, all of the diesel emissions associated with those trucks, sports stadium lights on for over 1 year will interrupt sleep, the noise violations from the drilling will go above state standards for allowed decibel (look at Erie Site that was shut down and now a possible moratorium), the tons of VOC emissions that come out of the ground while drilling and out of the Condensate Tanks in the facilities during the year of production phase, the permanent visual blight of the 25 foot high towers and 40 foot height VRU's. All of these intrusions pose credible threats to our community's health, welfare, safety and environment and to our property values. The CDPHE would be able to address our concerns and may come up with a document to support a number of mitigations not being considered by

Encana for our site location at this time. It has come to my attention that Weld County doesn't ask for CDPHE Assessments. How could this be? We are clearly asking for this kind of intervention and evaluation.

As well, there have already been numerous documented large nuisances from the Oil and Gas industry in the broader area around our home, including recently, Erie, and in our local vicinity (please refer to Carl Del Tufo comments for Rasmussen Wells). There have also been numerous undocumented violations because of the 'Good Neighbor' situation we have with Oil and Gas operators. Our rights have already been violated numerous times, though Encana denies these or does not claim them.

Violations of this sort will increase exponentially with 3 times the number of wells already on Section 19. There would be a total of 18 wells on the Rasmussen property alone. The dangers of spills, fires, explosions and leaks are real and present with massive industrial operations, and HVHF sites are Industrial.

Also, if the current applications were withdrawn now and a moratorium placed on Section 19, there could be a delay for submittal until the COGCC updates the rules to align more accurately with the massive Industrial operations that are now being applied for in neighborhoods all over Colorado. Our community and other communities like ours would benefit from these updated rules for High Volume Hydro-fracturing Sites because reasonable, prudent, and accurate rule and regulation making is bound to happen sometime, and would never allow these massive industrial sites anywhere near neighborhoods and communities. So these new, yet to be determined rules could prevent the victimization of communities like ours by not approving HVHF Sites in places where they do not belong in the State of Colorado. There would be accurate community analysis in the pre-application process before the formal applications ever submitted the COGCC website.

The Oil and Gas will remain in the ground, the amount under the Rasmussen property isn't changing or going anywhere, it can wait. What is the panic? Give this time, slow down the process. Get the Oil out in a 10 year process instead of an 18 month process. Encana's business model 'get the oil out as fast as possible, as much as possible, as soon as possible' (which an Encana representative told me numerous times when I asked why they don't wait) is going to destroy our way of life, our health, our welfare and our safety and the health of our environment. If Encana could be patient, there would be time for: collecting Community information, figuring out what is going on with CR1 and Rd. 18, finding out about the cemetery, transportation study results could be completed, CDPHE results – all of these important pieces of information could be collected and all of this takes time. Encana could wait then, for an indefinite period of time, and apply for permitting to see what happens with the pipeline going to the hub. Someone tell me what the rush is! Please stop the speed of the Rasmussen application process. Paying back loans from the \$ 22 million projected profits from these 12 wells would be on the backs and lives of our community. Of course, at the current price of oil profits would be half of 22 million, so what is the rush even from a business stand point????

I understand that Encana is submitting their applications within the current rules and regulations set out by the State of Colorado. And, while Encana and the COGCC may consider the applications complete, they are not inclusive of community and civil rights. I am proposing that while they are not breaking rules with their incomplete applications and plans to subject our community to this egregious drilling, I am proposing that Encana and the COGCC by proxy are breaking the law.

It is extremely likely there will be nuisances and violations caused by all of the drilling and production of the sites in part because of exponential increase in truck traffic and emissions. In spite of documented and peer reviewed evidence that harm is caused by HVHF Oil and Gas Extraction, Encana is still proposing to put these wells and facility sites in our midst. We are asking for 100% assurance that we will be safe, healthy and our welfare will be protected. Since danger and VOC emissions always exist with Oil and Gas extraction it can be concluded that Encana and the COGCC would be intentionally exposing us to these violations, nuisances and dangers that are inherent parts of Oil and Gas Industrial operations. Encana is unable to prove 100% safety the citizens of this area. Encana cannot assure 100%

	<p>health, safety welfare and a clean environment to our community and it is the responsibility of the COGCC to make sure they do.COGCC3460 1-2. These proposed sites threaten our inalienable rights to health, safety, welfare and a clean environment.Encana and the COGCC will be breaking constitutional laws if they proceed with these Wells and facility sites. It is against the law to intentionally harm your neighbor and violate their inalienable rights to health, safety, welfare and a clean environment.</p> <p>Mineral rights owners and their leasees have business level rights to their minerals, but all property owners have property and human rights, which supercede those mineral rights. The mineral owners do not exist in a vacuum.It is against the law to put a financial stake above a safety, health and welfare stake, minerals are secondary to mine and my family's safety and quality of life.</p> <p>As well, the burden of proof for 100% safety should be put on Encana, but since they are both unable and unwilling to do this, we must take matters into our own hands, this includes base level evaluations of a variety of conditions that numerous members of our community will engage in.</p> <p>If the Encana proposals continue as is, without the community's input, without entering all possible mitigations [[1)which include mine below*** 2) also a set of public comments in our behalf on the COGCC website 3) also those contained in both the CDPHE letter to the COGCC from Ken Kuster to Larimer County** 4)and also those listed in Boulder County's Moratorium Policy:GE 4.03 which contain 10 specific requests for mitigation measures]] into the applications, then you have failed in your job, which is to protectme, my family and all of the citizens who live within a 2 mile radius of the proposed Rasmussen Wells from harm.</p> <p>There have not been 'neighborhood conversations' and/or 'mediation' with participants from: our</p> <p>Community, Weld and Boulder Commissioners, the CDPHE, the LGD's from Weld and Boulder County, COGCC representatives, Mineral Rights Holder representatives and Encana Representatives who actually have the power to negotiate, therefore any real negotiations to make this situation the best for all parties involved have not occurred.Without substantial input about all of the above mentioned issues, there will be large mistakes made on the part of Encana and their associates, and by proxy, the COGCC has made those same mistakes.So, when the violations happen, and they will happen, either nuisance level or violation level, our only recourse as property owners will be to file suit for retroactive culpability in order to compensate us damages done to our health, safety, welfare and environment.</p> <p>If the current applications are removed, as they should be, and new applications submitted, some requests we would make would include but not be limited to:a real negotiation with all parties who would potentially be affected by wells being drilled,Mr. Parko asks for a Traffic Study andan Access Permit for any access point Encana plans to use off of the Ramusssen property for their drilling and facility site, numerous mitigation measures*** (listed at the end of this document), a reduction in the number of wells, all wells and facilities proposed moved to the farthest point away from all residents which would be in the far north field away from Rd. 18, and a CDPHE Assessment. Additionally, both Boulder and Weld citizens are severely impacted by these proposals so Weld County should work closely with the Boulder County LGDto evaluate and determine best use practices for any and all future Section 19 proposals, which would include Transportation Analysis' and Recommendations.</p> <p>In summation I am asking you again, to please reject and /or deny all Form 2 2a permit applications for the Pleasant View/Encana/Rasmussen well proposals.This project is in violation of the CO</p> <p>Constitution, Article 2, Section 3. Please do not allow the destruction of our rural community by allowing large scale industrial development in such close proximity to</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>our homes. We deserve and have the rights to clean air, clean water and healthy soil.</p> <p>I am asking you to look into our lives, our health, our landscape choice, and ask yourselves: How will these HVHF Industrial sites impact their lives?What is really happening there?What is this community saying to us?Find out, ask us questions! Everyone in our neighborhood has chosen to live a quiet, pristine, agricultural life. We deliberately chose to live away from traffic, construction, noise, lighting, industrial waste and emissions, toxic poisons and we are country people, not Industrial people.</p> <p>I ask you, how can it be okay with members of the COGCC, as stewards of the State of Colorado, it's people and it landscapes, how can you allowEncana to impose these egregious Industrial conditions into our lives knowing what we think and how we feel?Please stop these proposals as written, and create a well -rounded think tank so that all parties who are affected by Encana and the mineral owners requests to drill have equal voice and all are required to negotiate and compromise.</p> <p>We, the citizens of Pleasant View Rural Community, Mr. Lepore, are the reasons not to approve these 12 wells, 36 25 foot high towers, 12 separators and 12 burn-off towers into existence.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to voice these concerns to you.Thank you in advance for your time spent on these important issues and I, and my neighbors, look forward to working collaboratively with you and both Weld and Boulder County to resolve these glaringly apparent problems with the Encana proposals and creating a new proposal that fits into our all of our lives.</p> <p>**Please see another COGCCC Comment submitted by Amanda Harper – a copy of the CDPHE report for Larimer County, and recommendations for mitigating Hydrofracturing written by Ken Kuster, dated November 14, 2014.</p> <p>****Mitigation measures being requested by Amanda Harper.Ideally these would be added to a new application.These measures should be a part of the application for any number of wells from Encana:</p> <p>*1-3 wells, not 12, slows down extraction, but speed is a negotiable aspect of this application, and less wells work infinitely better for our neighborhood.</p> <p>*Waiver for Location site rejected.Move 1-3 wells over to the already existing well/facility site on Rasmussen property according to COGCC rules, new wells are supposed to be within 50 feet of existing wells. Even at the existing site, the wells are not sighted for the farthest possible distance from all residents of the area.The furthest distance location would actually be in Rasmussen's north field or in Moreno's field and then the hydrofracturing would go directionally to the south.This is an alternate plan that needs to be evaluated as it sets the drilling and facility site farthest away from all residents.Encana refused to discuss this option with me because another operator owns the surface rights on the north end, and it wasn't convenient (thus cheap) for them to drill as far away as possible from all residents. Rather they chose to use the Section Line 19 and Rd. 18 in their application, which brings the wells directly into the lives of many residents in this rural neighborhood.The far north location would mean that Rasmussen would not get the surface rights money from these 1-3 new wells, but more citizens would be protected from the drilling and tanks.</p> <p>*Do not use Rd. 18, either for Rasmussen drilling or Regnier Facility Site (being proposed in Feb 2015)</p> <p>*Use only fresh water, not Fracking water for dust mitigation on the roads</p> <p>*Lower the tank heights to 10 feet, nothing should be above 10 feet in height.Lower the VRU unit.</p> <p>*60# Drought resistant trees planted to surround facility site on East, South and North sides.These trees are to be cared for by the Operator</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>*A Traffic study which would be conducted by a collaboration of Weld and Boulder County to protect CR1 itself and the citizens who use it from the increased traffic from the 1-3 wells being drilled and the tankers who collect the oil.</p> <p>*Any and All traffic mitigation measures determined as prudent by the results of this study would be used to protect public safety health and welfare of all the neighbors in this area.</p> <p>*An Access permit would be applied for by Encana to Weld County Public Works for use of road off of CR1</p> <p>*A CDPHE Assessment is done in this area. There is already a large amount of VOC pollution from Fracking sites near this location, so a base level study would need to be conducted. Then a projected amount of VOC's added to base if 3 more wells and their facility sites were added into equation to find out how detrimental 1-3 new wells would be to our health safety and welfare. Then there would be constant monitoring with the results being shared to community throughout drilling and production phases.</p> <p>*All new wells would have a VRU that would accommodate emissions</p> <p>*All new wells would have cement casing</p> <p>*An Electric Drilling Rig would be used so there would not be Low Frequency Noise Violations and noise mufflers for any other part of the operations would be utilized wherever possible</p> <p>*Drilling would not happen at night – there would not be a need for Sports Stadium Lights</p> <p>*Employ all recommendations from CDPHE letter from Ken Kuster dated December 14, 2014 to the Rasmussen Well Site and Facility Site</p> <p>*Employ all 10 mitigation measures stated in the Moratorium from Boulder County GE 4.03 to the Rasmussen Well Site and Facility Site</p>		
Public	<p>Carl G. Del Tufo, M.S.</p> <p>517 County Rd. 18</p> <p>Longmont, Co 80504</p> <p>January 10, 2015</p> <p>To: COGCC</p> <p>Re: Comments for Rasmussen 2N 68W SESW SWSW Section 19</p> <p>My name is Carl Del Tufo and I live and own a home and property on road 18 approximately 1200 feet from the proposed oil and gas extraction operation. I have grave concerns about the proposed operation and the impacts that it will have on the health and safety of my family and the prolonged degradation it will do to the environment and visual landscape.</p> <p>My concerns are based on the history of emissions violations, spills, road encroachment, and hydrocarbon poisoning already experienced by my neighbors from oil and gas extraction operations over the years. In addition, the proposed high volume operation represents a significant increase in extraction operations from what the area has historically seen. Combining the history of violations of personal and property rights from oil and gas extraction in the area with the significant increase in extraction proposed, I can only conclude that the proposed operation</p>	1/13/2015 8:33:25 AM	

represents a credible threat to the health and safety of me and my family. Before any application is approved I request a thorough investigation be done by the COGCC as to the history of violations and impacts to the residents of this area within a two mile radius. This will allow for a documented baseline of health, safety and environmental impacts in which to better comment on proposed operations. I will remind the COGCC of its value statements regarding its desire to earn the trust of the people of Colorado and its commitment to protect the public health and the environment.

The following is a list of incidents that have been mentioned by neighbors. I would like to know what operators were involved in these incidents, reports of how they occurred, how they were resolved and any changes that were made to safeguard future occurrences.

- Asbestos contamination East of the proposed site.
- Oil spill and tree damage from a tanker North and East of the proposed site.
- Oil leak directly into a flowing agricultural water ditch East of the proposed site.
- Emissions violations from a facility West of the proposed site.
- Hydrocarbon poisoning of individuals West of the proposed site.
- Road encroachments and truck traffic impacts on residents.
- Silica release and area contamination West of the proposed site.
- Noise complaints during previous drilling operations.

Some municipalities have studied the risks to public health and the environment associated with high volume fracking and have found them to be significant. In the case of Boulder County, located one quarter mile to the West of the proposed operation, a moratorium has been established until more study can be done to better assess the risks involved. New York State, on the advice from its own department of health, has banned this type of extraction all together.

From what I am finding out, high volume oil and gas extraction using hydrolic fracturing and horizontal drilling is an industrial, petro-chemical operation that is significantly bigger in scope and impact than conventional drilling practices. In the case here, twelve wells are proposed requiring nine to twelve months to drill and thousands upon thousands of truck trips. The proposed facilities pad will contain 36, 25 feet-high tanks with separators and burn-off stacks. There is no history of this level of industrial insult in this area.

The rights of the property owners and residents of this area are being superseded by those of mineral rights holders and oil and gas developers in this escalation of oil and gas extraction.

Please assist me and the growing group of concerned citizens in this area to better understand the level of injury already experienced by oil and gas extraction here so that we may be better informed about the risks imposed by the proposed escalation of operations.

Sincerely,

Carl G. Del Tufo, M.S.

Public	<p>I am writing to express EXTREME concern with the proposed wells on the Rasmussen property in the Pleasant View Rural Community of Weld County.</p> <p>The Pleasant View Rural Community has put forth very sound and exceedingly important requests for a revision in how gas/oil extraction in areas such as this become permitted. This area, a 2 mile radius from the intersection of East County Line Road 1 and Rd. 18, is a densely populated rural / agricultural use community. Their population is close to that of a Low Density Residential area, but at this time is considered a High Density Agricultural area. It is very important here to note that Low Density Residential areas only utilize the permitting process Use by Special Review, whereas agricultural land in Weld County is Use by Right.</p> <p>It is very sound reasoning on the part of this community that because there is a growing body of evidence that any oil and gas extraction and production facilities accommodating 4 or more wells represents a significant Land Use change, where large sites of 4 or more wells are industrial scale and thus inappropriate within 2 miles of the intersection of East County Line Road 1 and Rd. 18. Please seriously consider that the scale of these proposals goes outside of Use by Right and should be considered only through the Use for Special Review process. This community is fairly asking that there be a public process in the pre-application part of the process so that their input and concerns be included and clearly addressed in the proposal by Encana before consideration of the 12 wells, 36, 25 foot high Tanks, 12 separators, 12+ burn-off towers, 1 VRU unit 40 feet high, and other parts to the facility site (a total of 5 acres).</p> <p>In addition, this community has lined our further appropriate and common-sense requests for a Boulder County coordinated traffic study, of which the results be made available to the residents in this community.</p> <p>Finally, in further support of common sense approaches to situations such as this, noisy and toxin producing operations should be approved only in spatial locations that cause the least impact to the families and residents of the area, which in this case (if the permit does make it through final approval) be the far North field away from Rd. 18.</p>	<p>1/13/2015 12:19:42 AM</p>
--------	---	----------------------------------

Public	<p>I am writing to you in regards to County Road 18, and the 12 wells proposed by Encana on the Rausmussen property: Township 2N, Range 68W, Section 19 .</p> <p>My family and I have been residents on Road 18 for 27 years. Calling it a road is bit of an overstatement. Really, it is a one lane driveway, the only one that leads to our home.</p> <p>Having the kind of traffic associated with this magnitude of drilling on our one lane road will directly impact all of the residents, as we have to pull over for one another now in regular sized vehicles. It is entirely inappropriate for this area. The foundation of the road will not be able to withstand the weight demands placed on it. In the past, when we have had heavy traffic from the oil companies combined with heavy snow or rain, the road is nearly impassable. Over the past 27 years, the maintenance of the road by the oil companies has been inconsistent and mostly unacceptable. Due to the heavy use of this road by oil company trucks we have had to replace shocks on all of our vehicles, which have also required multiple alignments. The cost of maintaining the road has always been put on the people who live here.</p> <p>Pleasant View Ridge Cemetery will also be disturbed; mail boxes and utility poles will need to be moved; utility lines elevated, and a new culvert placed. The most recent of the 22 graves in the cemetery is 1916, with the earliest being 1893. It is neither respectful or acceptable to damage this historical site.</p> <p>If the decision is made to widen the road and disregard the cemetery, the issue of safety needs to be taken into consideration. Turning onto Road 18 from County Line Road can be extremely hazardous from both north and south directions when waiting for access to the road. Numerous gravel trucks travel East County Line with heavy loads and are usually exceeding the speed limit with the shoulder being non-existent. It is a harrowing experience to sit on County Line waiting for a big truck to exit Road 18 so we can get out of the flow of traffic.</p> <p>We as residents need Road 18 to get to work on time. It should not be our responsibility to schedule when we can safely travel road 18 to get to our jobs. Can you guarantee first responders will have immediate access to one of the neighbors if needed? How will we be compensated for the mental anguish; threat to our health; the noise and light pollution which will directly affect our sleep; destruction of our peaceful neighborhood and wildlife; and decrease of property value?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration</p>	1/12/2015 8:47:45 PM	
Public	<p>I have lived in southwest Weld County for 17 years near the proposed Rasmussen operation. I am concerned that this High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing will permanently alter the character of this unique area. Many of the properties in this area were homesteaded in the 1800's and formed the community of Pleasantview Ridge. The church and general store that once stood at the intersection of WCR1 and Road 18 no longer exist, but a school house dating from 1899 still stands and is listed on the National Register of Historic buildings. Boulder County officials recognized this as a heritage agricultural area. That is what prompted them to buy development rights on hundreds of acres to the north and west of my property. There is not another place quite like this anywhere along the Front Range.</p> <p>I am a Ph.D. chemist who has worked in the chemical manufacturing industry for 30 years so I am somewhat sympathetic to the oil and gas industry. My concerns relate not to whether oil and gas development should occur but rather how it should occur. In my industry we adhere to strict EHS standards, are heavily regulated and are held accountable for property damage, spills, emissions or any adverse effect on public health and safety. The oil and gas industry should be held to the same standards. I know the COGCC has voted to tighten standards and I applaud the commission for doing so.</p>	1/12/2015 5:34:47 PM	

Even with these new rules in place I am still concerned about my family's health and safety during the proposed drilling operations. Although the jury may be out on the exact long term effects of High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing, many recent studies show that there is ample reason for concern. The New York State Department of Health released a 184 page study on December 17th which documents these concerns in some detail. Among the concerns raised are the health effects of air emissions, particulate levels and noise, and the environmental effects from methane which is a very powerful greenhouse gas. Groundwater and surface contamination are also of great concern. Many people in this vicinity use wells and Boulder Creek lies barely half a mile from the proposed drilling site. Since no environmental impact study is required, only the COGCC is in a position to protect the citizens and the environment when operations of this type proceed.

I am concerned about the value of my home, since home prices are known to be adversely affected by High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing. I know from past experience that high intensity lighting and excessive noise rob people of sleep night after night and make it difficult for them to function in their own jobs and family responsibilities. I am concerned about loss of wildlife habitat. Past drilling operations have been of relatively short duration. A twelve well pad will disrupt wildlife for long enough to drive out some populations that live here or migrate through. We have had fox, white tailed deer and even bears in the area. I photographed a bald eagle in a tree in front of my house just last week. We have owls that hunt on our property every year as they migrate through and pheasants that mate and raise their young here. I fear we will never see these birds again after this drilling begins.

I have coexisted with oil and gas operations the whole time I have lived here but not without incident. In 2006 an ENCANA drilling crew drove down my driveway and damaged scores of trees and spilled oil along a 500 ft. section of road (case #2006-1102). I had no prior notification by ENCANA that they planned to bring a drilling rig down this road, and I was not informed after the accident happened. I came home at dusk and discovered the mayhem with no one on site. I had to drive to the well head and demand to speak with someone in authority. This same crew used chain saws to cut back large established trees near the cemetery at the corner of WCR1 and Road 18. They had no permission to do so. My neighbor's property was so severely contaminated with asbestos that Anadarko ended up buying part of his property from him. Trucks that service wells north of my property continually cut a corner on my property and eventually they drove the frost down far enough to freeze my meter which then had to be replaced and moved by Left Hand Water. The same trucks continue to cut the corner at WCR 1 and Road 18 and consequently have ruined the culvert there multiple times. I assume most of the people in oil and gas development are good and conscientious people but accidents happen and a massive scale-up of drilling operations will inevitably raise the risks for all of the residents in this area. I am not confident that all incidents are reported or properly investigated, nor am I confident that ENCANA is able to adequately protect the property rights of homeowners or the environment near the drilling site.

Road 18 is the only access to six homes in our neighborhood. It is also the only access for fire, ambulance and law enforcement vehicles. Years ago I was blocked by a tractor trailer stopped in the road to put chains on his rig. What if that been an emergency situation? The amount of truck traffic required for this activity will significantly impede traffic at the intersection of WCR1 and Road 18. I have seen no other large well pads that access public roads at a small intersection as this application proposes. WCR1 is heavily traveled between Hwy 52 and Hwy 66 by commuters of all types and has significant bicycle use on narrow shoulders. This is a real safety concern. Also, there is a historic cemetery at the intersection which needs to be preserved in its current state. Road 18 is on private property and is not a county road. It is not designed to handle the existing truck traffic, let alone an exponential increase that would come from the current proposal.

In its current state, I believe the ENCANA Rasmussen application should be withdrawn. If that is not to be the case, I respectfully ask that ENCANA be required to make significant changes to their proposal. I am requesting that the drilling be done from existing well locations or from a location(s) that is not so close to the many homes near the intersection of WCR1 and Road 18. Access to the drilling site (s) should be directly from WCR1 and not Road 18. The access point directly north

	<p>of the Rasmussen home is much better suited to the proposed operations. The impact of increased traffic on WCR1 should be discussed with Boulder County since that entity is responsible for maintenance between Hwy 119 and Hwy 52. If Road 18 is used for drilling these wells, a credible Transportation Plan should be presented which provides unimpeded access to residents, and which ensures that the cemetery and vegetation around it are preserved and that the road is returned to its current condition after drilling is completed.</p> <p>Electric or natural gas powered drilling rigs and all other possible noise suppression measures should be used. A Low Frequency Noise Analysis should be conducted. All possible dust mitigation measures should be taken including the use of fresh water on dirt roads. ENCANA should be required to mitigate light pollution by the use of carefully placed, low intensity directional lighting. Many other industrial operations do this routinely. Surface casings on each well should extend a minimum of 200 ft. beyond standard depth to protect shallow wells and surface water. Baseline testing of air and water should be done before, during and after drilling operations. The best way to mitigate many of these issues would be to complete a pipeline to the centralized collection facility in Erie before drilling begins. If drilling is done before completion of the pipeline, low profile condensate tanks should be used and the tank battery should be shielded by walls and vegetation.</p> <p>I am for energy independence and for developing natural resources, but unless companies like ENCANA are progressive and proactive in addressing concerns about High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing, they may win battles now but they will lose the war in the long run. Only the COGCC can push these companies in a direction so that the conversation in Colorado is about how to frack, and not whether to frack. Lastly, I request the courtesy of a written response to each of the concerns raised above.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.</p>		
Public	<p>To the COGCC:</p> <p>We have been contacted by the Pleasant View community in regard to the Encana-Rasmussen project. We insist that you deny/reject all Form 2 and 2a permit applications for this project area. The proposed project is in violation of their natural, essential and inalienable rights to: enjoy their lives; protect their property; and seek and obtain their safety and happiness--as enumerated in Article 2 Section 3 of the Colorado Constitution. Due to the inherent health risks associated with fracking and its deleterious effects on our Climate, we also find this project to be inconsistent with the public interest as defined by the CO Oil and Gas Conservation Act § 34-60-102. Legislative declaration (1) (a) It is declared to be in the public interest to: (I) Foster the responsible, balanced development, production, and utilization of the natural resources of oil and gas in the state of Colorado *in a manner consistent with protection of public health, safety, and welfare, including protection of the environment and wildlife resources.</p> <p>*Please, see the 2nd edition of the Concerned Health Professionals of New York's Compendium of Scientific, Medical and Media Findings Demonstrating Risks and Harms of Fracking http://concernedhealthny.org/.../CHPNY-Fracking-Compendium.pdf</p> <p>In addition to the reasons we've listed above, the Pleasant View community has cited these specific reasons as to why they feel this should be rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Roads leading in and out of the proposed fracking zone are not clearly publicly owned, and private ownership is not clearly held solely by the mineral rights seller, said problematic ownership leading Encana to file numerous documents of dubious authority to get around rules which would prevent its access and egress from well sites. -There is an historic cemetery on which Encana or its appointees may have already trespassed without approval, which would have to be compromised to make room 	1/12/2015 12:24:53 PM	

	<p>for fracking operations access and egress.</p> <p>-Fracking operations would result in massive increases in traffic, road and neighborhood impacts and pollution along East County Line Road, impacts which have not been sufficiently related to or vetted by Boulder County.</p> <p>-The community sits on quaternary alluvium, which could facilitate drainage of inevitable fracking spills and leaks into the Boulder Creek watershed, a potentiality which has not been related to or vetted by Boulder County.</p> <p>-There is historical significance to the Pleasant View Ridge school house, a site that will be compromised by fracking operations.</p> <p>The vast majority of the community, with the exception of the profiting mineral owner, does not want this massively industrial-scaled activity adjacent to their homes, and feels it will ruin their lives, health, home values, and futures, forcing some to consider immediately selling or vacating their homes.</p> <p>-There are water wells of varying ages in the vicinity that would not be adequately protected by standard surface casing depths. These surface casing depths would need to be extended by at least an additional 200' to provide nominal protection to these water sources. -</p> <p>-In addition, continuous post-drilling water quality monitoring would be necessary, instead of the standard single post-drilling water sampling, said continuous monitoring results to be available real-time to a community representative.</p> <p>It is for all of these reasons and more that our organizations and the hundreds of thousands of Coloradans that we represent, insist that the COGCC take the necessary actions to deny/reject these permits.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Frack Free Colorado</p> <p>Boulder County Citizens for Community Rights</p> <p>Clean Energy Action</p> <p>Earth Guardians</p> <p>Food and Water Watch</p> <p>Our Broomfield</p> <p>Protect Our Loveland</p> <p>The Mothers Project of Colorado</p> <p>Weld Air and Water</p>		
--	---	--	--

Public	<p>We have been contacted by the Pleasant View community, at least one of whose residents is a member of the Sierra Club. After having researched the situation and the threat the community faces from Encana's plans for industrial-scaled fracking in this residential/agricultural neighborhood, we share their extreme concern, and request that you deny/reject all Form 2 and 2a permit applications for this project area.</p> <p>Some of the specific reasons why this project should be rejected include:</p> <p>Roads leading in and out of the proposed fracking zone are not clearly publicly owned, and private ownership is not clearly held solely by the mineral rights seller, said problematic ownership leading Encana to file numerous documents of dubious authority to get around rules which would prevent its access and egress from well sites.</p> <p>There is an historic cemetery on which Encana or its appointees may have already trespassed without approval, which would have to be compromised to make room for fracking operations access and egress.</p> <p>Fracking operations would result in massive increases in traffic, road and neighborhood impacts and pollution along East County Line Road, impacts which have not been sufficiently related to or vetted by Boulder County.</p> <p>The community sits on quaternary alluvium, which could facilitate drainage of inevitable fracking spills and leaks into the Boulder Creek watershed, a potentiality which has not been related to or vetted by Boulder County.</p> <p>There is historical significance to the Pleasant View Ridge school house, a site that will be compromised by fracking operations.</p> <p>The vast majority of the community, with the exception of the profiting mineral owner, does not want this massively industrial-scaled activity adjacent to their homes, and feels it will ruin their lives, health, home values, and futures, forcing some to consider immediately selling or vacating their homes.</p> <p>There are water wells of varying ages in the vicinity that would not be adequately protected by standard surface casing depths. These surface casing depths would need to be extended by at least an additional 200' to provide nominal protection to these water sources. In addition, continuous post-drilling water quality monitoring would be necessary, instead of the standard single post-drilling water sampling, said continuous monitoring results to be available real-time to a community representative.</p> <p>For all these reasons and more, we respectfully request that you act on behalf of the citizens of the Pleasant View community, and take the necessary steps to have these permits and fracking activities denied or rejected.</p>	12/26/2014 3:59:51 PM
Permit	The Certification of Compliance with Rule 305.a Pre-Application Notice is under "OTHER'.	12/23/2014 10:26:35 AM
OGLA	Public comment and LGD comment periods extended from 1/4/15 to 1/14/15 at the request of the LGD	12/17/2014 9:42:48 AM
Permit	Passed completeness.	12/15/2014 7:52:17 AM
OGLA	Passed Buffer Zone completeness review. Facilities count on Form does not include existing equipment at location. No indication on Form whether existing Facilities will remain. To be addressed during technical review.	12/12/2014 4:36:03 PM

OGLA	Buffer Zone review - this Form 2A includes physically separated well and production areas - each has a separate planned access road. The planned production area will overlap and be adjacent to an existing Encana Location - ID#322976. Discussed with Operator on 12/12/14 that this should be permitted as two locations with two separate Form 2As. The planned production area should be on an Amended 2A for an Existing Location ID #322976. The planned wells should be permitted as a new Location. Will push to DRAFT to allow the Operator to revise and resubmit.	12/11/2014 10:44:20 AM
Permit	Located within buffer zone; sent to OGLA for further review.	12/11/2014 7:26:49 AM

Total: 35 comment(s)